

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/033,632	10/033,632 12/26/2001		Timothy J. Brennan	P05435US0	P05435US0 9250	
22885	7590	09/30/2003				
		ES & SEASE, P.L	EXAMI	EXAMINER		
801 GRAND SUITE 3200			GEORGE, KONATA M			
DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1616	<i>h</i>	
				DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003	Įυ	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/033,632	BRENNAN, TIMOTHY J.					
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Konata M. George	1616					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 26 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:							
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•						
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·					
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>							
•							

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicants argue that the prior art teaches the use of the compound as a spinal analgesic agent and not for spinal anesthesia. It is the position of the examiner that the since the prior art teaches the exact same compound then the compound would have the same effect. The only difference would be the amount of agent used. The more agent used, the more motor and sensory response would be blocked, the less agent the less effect it would have over the spinal cord. Applicant argues that injection of an analgesic intrathecally would not produce anesthesia. Examiner agrees with the applicant, however, the claimed invention and the prior a are the same compound, so it is the position of the examiner that if the same amount of the claimed agent and the same amount of the agent of the prior art was introduced intrathecally the the same effects would happen. If two different agents were used one an anesthesia and the other an analgesic then it would not have the same effect. Applicants agrue that the prior art does not teach the mode of administration, examiner relied on the secondary reference to teach how spinal anesthesia is administered, therefore, one of ordinary skil in the art would have looked upon this technique as a way to administer the anesthesia..

THURMAN K. PAGE SUPERVISORY PATERITY EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600